

Applicants also note that, while Claim 11 is noted in the Office Action as demonstrating a different species, Claim 11 also includes the feature of paragraph [0007], making it also part of the first species; in other words, if a species is defined by the inclusion of the features disclosed in paragraph [0007], Applicants believe that such a species includes Claim 11. (Applicants further point out that if a claim may be included in two or more species, it is generic to the two or more species; see MPEP 806.04(d).)

Applicants further note that this election requirement is almost identical to that issued on June 30, 2008, except for the addition of the fourth species. Consequently, Applicants' response is also almost the same. Should the Examiner decide to issue a further election of species requirement, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner provide clearer definitions of the species, preferably including lists of claims belonging to each species.

Conclusion

Applicants believe that the above election and remarks fully address the restriction requirement and the PTO Communication noted above. Applicants, therefore, respectfully request prompt and favorable reconsideration of this application, in view of the election/remarks.

If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Respectfully submitted,

/Jeffrey W. Gluck/

Date: December 8, 2008

Jeffrey W. Gluck, Ph.D.
Registration No. 44,457
Connolly Bove Lodge & Hutz LLP
1875 Eye Street NW, Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20006
Telephone: 202-331-7111
Direct Dial: 202-572-0322
Facsimile: 202-293-6229

JWG/bms
CB-648699